

## The Times.

THE TIMES COMPANY

TIMES BUILDING,  
TENTH AND BANK STREETS,  
RICHMOND, VA.

THE WEEKLY TIMES—issued and mailed in two parts—One dollar a year by mail—anywhere in the United States. Address all communications and correspondence to The Times Company, Reading Room, in reading-matter type 20 cents per line.

Cards of advertising rates for space furnished on application. Remit by draft, check, postoffice order, or registered letter. Currency sent by mail at the risk of the sender. New Times Telephone, Business Office, New Phone, 231; Old Phone, 549. Editorial Office, New Phone, 231; Old Phone, 549. Rooms—New Phone, 231; Old Phone, 549. Circulation Room—New Phone, 231.

Specimen copies free. All subscriptions by mail payable in advance. Watch the label on your paper, if you live out of Richmond, and see when your subscription expires, so you can renew before the paper is stopped.

THE TIMES COMPANY.  
MANCHESTER BUILDING, 121 HULL STREET.PETERSBURG AGENT, J. A. MADISON,  
11 EAST TARR STREET,  
BELL PHONE, 263.

The Times is always indebted to friends and patrons, but must urge that all such be sent over the signature of the sender. All unsigned communications will be rejected.

THE DAILY TIMES is served by carriers on their own account in this city and Manchester, for 10 cents a week, by mail outside of Richmond, 10 cents a month, \$5.00 a year—anywhere in the United States.

THE MAILING LIST IS ONLY PRINTED ABOUT EVERY TEN DAYS. THEREFORE, DO NOT FEEL UNEASINESS IN THE DATE OPPOSITE YOUR NAME IN THE LITTLE PINK SLIP IS NOT CHANGED AS SOON AS THE SUBSCRIPTION IS RENEWED.

WE DESIRE TO CALL THE ATTENTION OF ALL PERSONS SENDING POLITICAL NEWS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS TO THE TIMES TO THE NECESSITY OF SIGNING THEIR NAMES TO SUCH REPORTS, AS IT IS THE RULE OF THIS PAPER TO PUBLISH ANY ARTICLE IN THE NAME OF WHOM THE AUTHOR IS UNKNOWN. REJECTED CONTRIBUTIONS WILL NOT BE RETURNED UNLESS ACCOMPANIED BY STAMPS.

The price of The Times is two cents per copy and ten cents per week, delivery within the limits of Richmond and Manchester. Sunday paper three cents.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1897.

TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION.

The joint resolution introduced by Mr. Parker, of Southampton, providing for the appointment of a joint committee of four members of the Senate and five of the House, to whom all bills and resolutions should be referred, looking towards an amendment of the Constitution, meets with our hearty approval. It is, indeed, what this paper has time and again advocated. Our first suggestion, made before the vote on the question of holding a Constitutional Convention was taken, was for a Constitutional Commission, which should be empowered to sit during the session of the Legislature, and this was amended by the suggestion of the joint committee which the Parker joint resolution provides for and which will answer the same purpose.

Mr. Parker took occasion to say that the newspapers were responsible for the defeat of the proposition to call a Constitutional Convention, taking the ground that the Legislature was fully able to pass all necessary amendments. He desired to make an honest effort in that direction to either secure success or to prove that the newspapers had been mistaken.

Mr. Parker seems to be disposed to discredit his own resolution, but we can see no sufficient reason for failure.

This is certainly the model way of amending the Constitution, although the process is slow, for the people are thus permitted to pass finally upon the changes proposed. It is altogether practicable in this way to remodel that instrument, retaining all that is good, purging it of all that is bad and adding such other provisions as may be desirable, each in the form of a separate amendment.

The success of the plan depends upon the Legislature, and if those who fought so gallantly for a Constitutional Convention will exert themselves as earnestly in behalf of the amendment plan, it will succeed. We hope the Legislature will address itself to the subject in good earnest, and that the committee will invite judges and Commonwealth's attorneys and other citizens who are in a position to know in what respect changes are desirable, especially in the direction of reduced expenses of government.

## THE OYSTER TAX.

The Portsmouth Times, in commenting on the Governor's message, says that, "like all up-country statesmen who want to make themselves solid with their neighbors, he wants to increase the tax on the poor oystermen." Would it not be equally as fair to say that in this comment our contemporary "wants to make itself solid with the oystermen"? The Governor suggests simply that the law be changed so as to prevent evasion and to compel those who are assessed to pay the tax as assessed to the Commonwealth.

The oysters belong to the State of Virginia, to the whole people of Virginia, and not to any one class, and it is entirely right and proper that those who catch oysters should give to the State its fair share of the catch.

There is a great deal of clap-trap in this cry against "taxing the poor oystermen." The oysterman does not pay the tax any more than the manufacturer pays the tax on tobacco. In all such cases the tax is added to the price of the article and is paid by the consumer. There is no reason under the sun why the State should not have a larger revenue from the large oyster traffic in its borders, and the Legislature now sitting should see to it that the laws are so framed as to make evasion impossible.

EMBARRASSED CONTEMPORARIES. Some of our free silver contemporaries that are honestly in favor of repealing the 10 per cent. tax on State banks find themselves somewhat embarrassed by the fact that the Hon. William Jennings Bryan is unequivocally opposed to State banks of issue. Mr. Bryan openly declared in the halls of Congress that he was not bound by that plank in the Chicago platform of 1892, because he had as much as his disgust with the Richmond tobacco market. He said that was

the best market. Your scribe said the merchants from Blackstone and Petersburg went to Richmond to buy tobacco as they could get it cheaper there than they could at their home markets. He said that Richmond buys a great deal of tobacco from all over the country and that it was the best place to buy tobacco. Your scribe replied yes, but it was a very poor place to sell.

This sounds as if it were written in a spirit of spite, or for effect, but whatever the nature, there is something in it for Richmond tobaccoists to think about. There ought not to be any sort of excuse for the statement that Richmond is not a good tobacco market or that prices are lower here than in the little towns of Blackstone and Farmville. Richmond ought to be one of the largest and best markets in the State and to make it so lively that slurs like the above would not be credited, even if uttered.

And Richmond can have such a market if her live men will only determine in good earnest that it shall be done. Would it not be a good idea to have one of the citizens' meetings at the Chamber of Commerce devoted entirely to the discussion of the tobacco question?

FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY. Another meeting of citizens of Richmond will be held on Tuesday night to discuss matters concerning the business welfare of the community.

These meetings are in no sense exclusive. They are not held in the interest of any one class of citizens, but for the general welfare of the community, and everybody who feels an interest in this question is welcome.

Several gentlemen have consented to make addresses and other citizens should at least be willing to do as much as to give the influence of their presence.

At the last meeting a number of suggestions were made, and as already stated in these columns, several of the Virginia papers spoke approvingly of them—notably of the proposition to take such steps as may be necessary to secure to Richmond the authority to exempt manufacturing plants from municipal taxation. This is an extreme and dangerous method of securing business, but the Petersburg Index-Appal, the Danville Register and other newspapers have come out boldly for an amendment to the Constitution, if such amendment be necessary, in order to confer that privilege upon the towns and cities of Virginia.

We trust that other suggestions less liable to objection will be made at the meeting on Tuesday night, and we hope that the attendance will be large and that an interest will be manifested commensurate with the importance of the occasion.

THE PRICE OF THE TIMES IS TWO CENTS PER COPY AND TEN CENTS PER WEEK, DELIVERY WITHIN THE LIMITS OF RICHMOND AND MANCHESTER. SUNDAY PAPER THREE CENTS.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1897.

TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION.

The joint resolution introduced by Mr. Parker, of Southampton, providing for the appointment of a joint committee of four members of the Senate and five of the House, to whom all bills and resolutions should be referred, looking towards an amendment of the Constitution, meets with our hearty approval. It is, indeed, what this paper has time and again advocated. Our first suggestion, made before the vote on the question of holding a Constitutional Convention was taken, was for a Constitutional Commission, which should be empowered to sit during the session of the Legislature, and this was amended by the suggestion of the joint committee which the Parker joint resolution provides for and which will answer the same purpose.

Mr. Parker took occasion to say that the newspapers were responsible for the defeat of the proposition to call a Constitutional Convention, taking the ground that the Legislature was fully able to pass all necessary amendments. He desired to make an honest effort in that direction to either secure success or to prove that the newspapers had been mistaken.

Mr. Parker seems to be disposed to discredit his own resolution, but we can see no sufficient reason for failure.

This is certainly the model way of amending the Constitution, although the process is slow, for the people are thus permitted to pass finally upon the changes proposed. It is altogether practicable in this way to remodel that instrument, retaining all that is good, purging it of all that is bad and adding such other provisions as may be desirable, each in the form of a separate amendment.

The success of the plan depends upon the Legislature, and if those who fought so gallantly for a Constitutional Convention will exert themselves as earnestly in behalf of the amendment plan, it will succeed. We hope the Legislature will address itself to the subject in good earnest, and that the committee will invite judges and Commonwealth's attorneys and other citizens who are in a position to know in what respect changes are desirable, especially in the direction of reduced expenses of government.

## THE OYSTER TAX.

The Portsmouth Times, in commenting on the Governor's message, says that, "like all up-country statesmen who want to make themselves solid with their neighbors, he wants to increase the tax on the poor oystermen." Would it not be equally as fair to say that in this comment our contemporary "wants to make itself solid with the oystermen"? The Governor suggests simply that the law be changed so as to prevent evasion and to compel those who are assessed to pay the tax as assessed to the Commonwealth.

The oysters belong to the State of Virginia, to the whole people of Virginia, and not to any one class, and it is entirely right and proper that those who catch oysters should give to the State its fair share of the catch.

There is a great deal of clap-trap in this cry against "taxing the poor oystermen." The oysterman does not pay the tax any more than the manufacturer pays the tax on tobacco. In all such cases the tax is added to the price of the article and is paid by the consumer. There is no reason under the sun why the State should not have a larger revenue from the large oyster traffic in its borders, and the Legislature now sitting should see to it that the laws are so framed as to make evasion impossible.

EMBARRASSED CONTEMPORARIES. Some of our free silver contemporaries that are honestly in favor of repealing the 10 per cent. tax on State banks find themselves somewhat embarrassed by the fact that the Hon. William Jennings Bryan is unequivocally opposed to State banks of issue. Mr. Bryan openly declared in the halls of Congress that he was not bound by that plank in the Chicago platform of 1892, because he had as much as his disgust with the Richmond tobacco market. He said that was

the best market. Your scribe said the merchants from Blackstone and Petersburg went to Richmond to buy tobacco as they could get it cheaper there than they could at their home markets. He said that Richmond buys a great deal of tobacco from all over the country and that it was the best place to buy tobacco. Your scribe replied yes, but it was a very poor place to sell.

This sounds as if it were written in a spirit of spite, or for effect, but whatever the nature, there is something in it for Richmond tobaccoists to think about. There ought not to be any sort of excuse for the statement that Richmond is not a good tobacco market or that prices are lower here than in the little towns of Blackstone and Farmville. Richmond ought to be one of the largest and best markets in the State and to make it so lively that slurs like the above would not be credited, even if uttered.

And Richmond can have such a market if her live men will only determine in good earnest that it shall be done. Would it not be a good idea to have one of the citizens' meetings at the Chamber of Commerce devoted entirely to the discussion of the tobacco question?

FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY. Another meeting of citizens of Richmond will be held on Tuesday night to discuss matters concerning the business welfare of the community.

These meetings are in no sense exclusive. They are not held in the interest of any one class of citizens, but for the general welfare of the community, and everybody who feels an interest in this question is welcome.

Several gentlemen have consented to make addresses and other citizens should at least be willing to do as much as to give the influence of their presence.

At the last meeting a number of suggestions were made, and as already stated in these columns, several of the Virginia papers spoke approvingly of them—notably of the proposition to take such steps as may be necessary to secure to Richmond the authority to exempt manufacturing plants from municipal taxation. This is an extreme and dangerous method of securing business, but the Petersburg Index-Appal, the Danville Register and other newspapers have come out boldly for an amendment to the Constitution, if such amendment be necessary, in order to confer that privilege upon the towns and cities of Virginia.

We trust that other suggestions less liable to objection will be made at the meeting on Tuesday night, and we hope that the attendance will be large and that an interest will be manifested commensurate with the importance of the occasion.

THE PRICE OF THE TIMES IS TWO CENTS PER COPY AND TEN CENTS PER WEEK, DELIVERY WITHIN THE LIMITS OF RICHMOND AND MANCHESTER. SUNDAY PAPER THREE CENTS.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1897.

TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION.

The joint resolution introduced by Mr. Parker, of Southampton, providing for the appointment of a joint committee of four members of the Senate and five of the House, to whom all bills and resolutions should be referred, looking towards an amendment of the Constitution, meets with our hearty approval. It is, indeed, what this paper has time and again advocated. Our first suggestion, made before the vote on the question of holding a Constitutional Convention was taken, was for a Constitutional Commission, which should be empowered to sit during the session of the Legislature, and this was amended by the suggestion of the joint committee which the Parker joint resolution provides for and which will answer the same purpose.

Mr. Parker took occasion to say that the newspapers were responsible for the defeat of the proposition to call a Constitutional Convention, taking the ground that the Legislature was fully able to pass all necessary amendments. He desired to make an honest effort in that direction to either secure success or to prove that the newspapers had been mistaken.

Mr. Parker seems to be disposed to discredit his own resolution, but we can see no sufficient reason for failure.

This is certainly the model way of amending the Constitution, although the process is slow, for the people are thus permitted to pass finally upon the changes proposed. It is altogether practicable in this way to remodel that instrument, retaining all that is good, purging it of all that is bad and adding such other provisions as may be desirable, each in the form of a separate amendment.

The success of the plan depends upon the Legislature, and if those who fought so gallantly for a Constitutional Convention will exert themselves as earnestly in behalf of the amendment plan, it will succeed. We hope the Legislature will address itself to the subject in good earnest, and that the committee will invite judges and Commonwealth's attorneys and other citizens who are in a position to know in what respect changes are desirable, especially in the direction of reduced expenses of government.

## THE OYSTER TAX.

The Portsmouth Times, in commenting on the Governor's message, says that, "like all up-country statesmen who want to make themselves solid with their neighbors, he wants to increase the tax on the poor oystermen." Would it not be equally as fair to say that in this comment our contemporary "wants to make itself solid with the oystermen"? The Governor suggests simply that the law be changed so as to prevent evasion and to compel those who are assessed to pay the tax as assessed to the Commonwealth.

The oysters belong to the State of Virginia, to the whole people of Virginia, and not to any one class, and it is entirely right and proper that those who catch oysters should give to the State its fair share of the catch.

There is a great deal of clap-trap in this cry against "taxing the poor oystermen." The oysterman does not pay the tax any more than the manufacturer pays the tax on tobacco. In all such cases the tax is added to the price of the article and is paid by the consumer. There is no reason under the sun why the State should not have a larger revenue from the large oyster traffic in its borders, and the Legislature now sitting should see to it that the laws are so framed as to make evasion impossible.

EMBARRASSED CONTEMPORARIES. Some of our free silver contemporaries that are honestly in favor of repealing the 10 per cent. tax on State banks find themselves somewhat embarrassed by the fact that the Hon. William Jennings Bryan is unequivocally opposed to State banks of issue. Mr. Bryan openly declared in the halls of Congress that he was not bound by that plank in the Chicago platform of 1892, because he had as much as his disgust with the Richmond tobacco market. He said that was

the best market. Your scribe said the merchants from Blackstone and Petersburg went to Richmond to buy tobacco as they could get it cheaper there than they could at their home markets. He said that Richmond buys a great deal of tobacco from all over the country and that it was the best place to buy tobacco. Your scribe replied yes, but it was a very poor place to sell.

This sounds as if it were written in a spirit of spite, or for effect, but whatever the nature, there is something in it for Richmond tobaccoists to think about. There ought not to be any sort of excuse for the statement that Richmond is not a good tobacco market or that prices are lower here than in the little towns of Blackstone and Farmville. Richmond ought to be one of the largest and best markets in the State and to make it so lively that slurs like the above would not be credited, even if uttered.

And Richmond can have such a market if her live men will only determine in good earnest that it shall be done. Would it not be a good idea to have one of the citizens' meetings at the Chamber of Commerce devoted entirely to the discussion of the tobacco question?

FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY. Another meeting of citizens of Richmond will be held on Tuesday night to discuss matters concerning the business welfare of the community.

These meetings are in no sense exclusive. They are not held in the interest of any one class of citizens, but for the general welfare of the community, and everybody who feels an interest in this question is welcome.

Several gentlemen have consented to make addresses and other citizens should at least be willing to do as much as to give the influence of their presence.

At the last meeting a number of suggestions were made, and as already stated in these columns, several of the Virginia papers spoke approvingly of them—notably of the proposition to take such steps as may be necessary to secure to Richmond the authority to exempt manufacturing plants from municipal taxation. This is an extreme and dangerous method of securing business, but the Petersburg Index-Appal, the Danville Register and other newspapers have come out boldly for an amendment to the Constitution, if such amendment be necessary, in order to confer that privilege upon the towns and cities of Virginia.

We trust that other suggestions less liable to objection will be made at the meeting on Tuesday night, and we hope that the attendance will be large and that an interest will be manifested commensurate with the importance of the occasion.

THE PRICE OF THE TIMES IS TWO CENTS PER COPY AND TEN CENTS PER WEEK, DELIVERY WITHIN THE LIMITS OF RICHMOND AND MANCHESTER. SUNDAY PAPER THREE CENTS.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1897.

TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION.

The joint resolution introduced by Mr. Parker, of Southampton, providing for the appointment of a joint committee of four members of the Senate and five of the House, to whom all bills and resolutions should be referred, looking towards an amendment of the Constitution, meets with our hearty approval. It is, indeed, what this paper has time and again advocated. Our first suggestion, made before the vote on the question of holding a Constitutional Convention was taken, was for a Constitutional Commission, which should be empowered to sit during the session of the Legislature, and this was amended by the suggestion of the joint committee which the Parker joint resolution provides for and which will answer the same purpose.

Mr. Parker took occasion to say that the newspapers were responsible for the defeat of the proposition to call a Constitutional Convention, taking the ground that the Legislature was fully able to pass all necessary amendments. He desired to make an honest effort in that direction to either secure success or to prove that the newspapers had been mistaken.

Mr. Parker seems to be disposed to discredit his own resolution, but we can see no sufficient reason for failure.

This is certainly the model way of amending the Constitution, although the process is slow, for the people are thus permitted to pass finally upon the changes proposed. It is altogether practicable in this way to remodel that instrument, retaining all that is good, purging it of all that is bad and adding such other provisions as may be desirable, each in the form of a separate amendment.

The success of the plan depends upon the Legislature, and if those who fought so gallantly for a Constitutional Convention will exert themselves as earnestly in behalf of the amendment plan, it will succeed. We hope the Legislature will address itself to the subject in good earnest, and that the committee will invite judges and Commonwealth's attorneys and other citizens who are in a position to know in what respect changes are desirable, especially in the direction of reduced expenses of government.

## THE OYSTER TAX.

The Portsmouth Times, in commenting on the Governor's message, says that, "like all up-country statesmen who want to make themselves solid with their neighbors, he wants to increase the tax on the poor oystermen." Would it not be equally as fair to say that in this comment our contemporary "wants to make itself solid with the oystermen"? The Governor suggests simply that the law be changed so as to prevent evasion and to compel those who are assessed to pay the tax as assessed to the Commonwealth.

The oysters belong to the State of Virginia, to the whole people of Virginia, and not to any one class, and it is entirely right and proper that those who catch oysters should give to the State its fair share of the catch.

There is a great deal of clap-trap in this cry against "taxing the poor oystermen." The oysterman does not pay the tax any more than the manufacturer pays the tax on tobacco. In all such cases the tax is added to the price of the article and is paid by the consumer. There is no reason under the sun why the State should not have a larger revenue from the large oyster traffic in its borders, and the Legislature now sitting should see to it that the laws are so framed as to make evasion impossible.

EMBARRASSED CONTEMPORARIES. Some of our free silver contemporaries that are honestly in favor of repealing the 10 per cent. tax on State banks find themselves somewhat embarrassed by the fact that the Hon. William Jennings Bryan is unequivocally opposed to State banks of issue. Mr. Bryan openly declared in the halls of Congress that he was not bound by that plank in the Chicago platform of 1892, because he had as much as his disgust with the Richmond tobacco market. He said that was

the best market. Your scribe said the merchants from Blackstone and Petersburg went to Richmond to buy tobacco as they could get it cheaper there than they could at their home markets. He said that Richmond buys a great deal of tobacco from all over the country and that it was the best place to buy tobacco. Your scribe replied yes, but it was a very poor place to sell.

This sounds as if it were written in a spirit of spite, or for effect, but whatever the nature, there is something in it for Richmond tobaccoists to think about. There ought not to be any sort of excuse for the statement that Richmond is not a good tobacco market or that prices are lower here than in the little towns of Blackstone and Farmville. Richmond ought to be one of the largest and best markets in the State and to make it so lively that slurs like the above would not be credited, even if uttered.

And Richmond can have such a market if her live men will only determine in good earnest that it shall be done. Would it not be a good idea to have one of the citizens' meetings at the Chamber of Commerce devoted entirely to the discussion of the tobacco question?

FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY. Another meeting of citizens of Richmond will be held on Tuesday night to discuss matters concerning the business welfare of the community.

These meetings are in no sense exclusive. They are not held in the interest of any one class of citizens, but for the general welfare of the community, and everybody who feels an interest in this question is welcome.

Several gentlemen have consented to make addresses and other citizens should at least be willing to do as much as to give the influence of their presence.

At the last meeting a number of suggestions were made, and as already stated in these columns, several of the Virginia papers spoke approvingly of them—notably of the proposition to take such steps as may be necessary to secure to Richmond the authority to exempt manufacturing plants from municipal taxation. This is an extreme and dangerous method of securing business, but the Petersburg Index-Appal, the Danville Register and other newspapers have come out boldly for an amendment to the Constitution, if such amendment be necessary, in order to confer that privilege upon the towns and cities of Virginia.

We trust that other suggestions less liable to objection will be made at the meeting on Tuesday night, and we hope that the attendance will be large and that an interest will be manifested commensurate with the importance of the occasion.

THE PRICE OF THE TIMES IS TWO CENTS PER COPY AND TEN CENTS PER WEEK, DELIVERY WITHIN THE LIMITS OF RICHMOND AND MANCHESTER. SUNDAY PAPER THREE CENTS.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1897.

TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION.

The joint resolution introduced by Mr. Parker, of Southampton, providing for the appointment of a joint committee of four members of the Senate and five of the House, to whom all bills and resolutions should be referred, looking towards an amendment of the Constitution, meets with our hearty approval. It is, indeed, what this paper has time and again advocated. Our first suggestion, made before the vote on the question of holding a Constitutional Convention was taken, was for a Constitutional Commission, which should be empowered to sit during the session of the Legislature, and this was amended by the suggestion of the joint committee which the Parker joint resolution provides for and which will answer the same purpose.

Mr. Parker took occasion to say that the newspapers were responsible for the defeat of the proposition to call a Constitutional Convention, taking the ground that the Legislature was fully able to pass all necessary amendments. He desired to make an honest effort in that direction to either secure success or to prove that the newspapers had been mistaken.

Mr. Parker seems to be disposed to discredit his own resolution, but we can see no sufficient reason for failure.

This is certainly the model way of amending the Constitution, although the process is slow, for the people are thus permitted to pass finally upon the changes proposed. It is altogether practicable in this way to remodel that instrument, retaining all that is good, purging it of all that is bad and adding such other provisions as may be desirable, each in the form of a separate amendment.

The success of the plan depends upon the Legislature, and if those who fought so gallantly for a Constitutional Convention will exert themselves as earnestly in behalf of the amendment plan, it will succeed. We hope the Legislature will address itself to the subject in good earnest, and that the committee will invite judges and Commonwealth's attorneys and other citizens who are in a position to know in what respect changes are desirable, especially in the direction of reduced expenses of government.

## THE OYSTER TAX.

The Portsmouth Times, in commenting on the Governor's message, says that, "like all up-country statesmen who want to make themselves solid with their neighbors, he wants to increase the tax on the poor oystermen." Would it not be equally as fair to say that in this comment our contemporary "wants to make itself solid with the oystermen"? The Governor suggests simply that the law be changed so as to prevent evasion and to compel those who are assessed to pay the tax as assessed to the Commonwealth.

The oysters belong to the State of Virginia, to the whole people of Virginia, and not to any one class, and it is entirely right and proper that those who catch oysters should give to the State its fair share of the catch.

There is a great deal of clap-trap in this cry against "taxing the poor oystermen." The oysterman does not pay the tax any more than the manufacturer pays the tax on tobacco. In all such cases the tax is added to the price of the article and is paid by the consumer. There is no reason under the sun why the State should not have a larger revenue from the large oyster traffic in its borders, and the Legislature now sitting should see to it that the laws are so framed as to make evasion impossible.

EMBARRASSED CONTEMPORARIES. Some of our free silver contemporaries that are honestly in favor of repealing the 10 per cent. tax on State banks find themselves somewhat embarrassed by the fact that the Hon. William Jennings Bryan is unequivocally opposed to State banks of issue. Mr. Bryan openly declared in the halls of Congress that he was not bound by that plank in the Chicago platform of 1892, because he had as much as his disgust with the Richmond tobacco market. He said that was

the best market. Your scribe said the merchants from Blackstone and Petersburg went to Richmond to buy tobacco as they could get it cheaper there than they could at their home markets. He said that Richmond buys a great deal of tobacco from all over the country and that it was the best place to buy tobacco. Your scribe replied yes, but it was a very poor place to sell.

This sounds as if it were written in a spirit of spite, or for effect, but whatever the nature, there is something in it for Richmond tobaccoists to think about. There ought not to be any sort of excuse for the statement that Richmond is not a good tobacco market or that prices are lower here than in the little towns of Blackstone and Farmville. Richmond ought to be one of the largest and best markets in the State and to make it so lively that slurs like the above would not be credited, even if uttered.

And Richmond can have such a market if her live men will only determine in good earnest that it shall be done. Would it not be a good idea to have one of the citizens' meetings at the Chamber of Commerce devoted entirely to the discussion of the tobacco question?

FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY. Another meeting of citizens of Richmond will be held on Tuesday night to discuss matters concerning the business welfare of the community.

These meetings are in no sense exclusive. They are not held in the interest of any one class of citizens, but for the general welfare of the community, and everybody who feels an interest in this question is welcome.

Several gentlemen have consented to make addresses and other citizens should at least be willing to do as much as to give the influence of their presence.

At the last meeting a number of suggestions were made, and as already stated in these columns, several of the Virginia papers spoke approvingly of them—notably of the proposition to take such steps as may be necessary to secure to Richmond the authority to exempt manufacturing plants from municipal taxation. This is an extreme and dangerous method of securing business, but the Petersburg Index-Appal, the Danville Register and other newspapers have come out boldly for an amendment to the Constitution, if such amendment be necessary, in order to confer that privilege upon the towns and cities of Virginia.

We trust that other suggestions less liable to objection will be made at the meeting on Tuesday night, and we hope that the attendance will be large and that an interest will be manifested commensurate with the importance of the occasion.

THE PRICE OF THE TIMES IS TWO CENTS PER COPY AND TEN CENTS PER WEEK, DELIVERY WITHIN THE LIMITS OF RICHMOND AND MANCHESTER. SUNDAY PAPER THREE CENTS.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1897.

TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION.

The joint resolution introduced by Mr. Parker, of Southampton, providing for the appointment of a joint committee of four members of the Senate and five of the House, to whom all bills and resolutions should be referred, looking towards an amendment of the Constitution, meets with our hearty approval. It is, indeed, what this paper has time and again advocated. Our first suggestion, made before the vote on the question of holding a Constitutional Convention was taken, was for a Constitutional Commission, which should be empowered to sit during the session of the Legislature, and this was amended by the suggestion of the joint committee which the Parker joint resolution provides for and which will answer the same purpose.

Mr. Parker took occasion to say that the newspapers were responsible for the defeat of the proposition to call a Constitutional Convention, taking the ground that the Legislature was fully able to pass all necessary amendments. He desired to make an honest effort in that direction to either secure success or to prove that the newspapers had been mistaken.

Mr. Parker seems to be disposed to discredit his own resolution, but we can see no sufficient reason for failure.

This is certainly the model way of amending the Constitution, although the process is slow, for the people are thus permitted to pass finally upon the changes proposed. It is altogether practicable in this way to remodel that instrument, retaining all that is good, purging it of all that is bad and adding such other provisions as may be desirable, each in the form of a separate amendment.

The success of the plan depends upon the Legislature, and if those who fought so gallantly for a Constitutional Convention will exert themselves as earnestly in behalf of the amendment plan, it will succeed. We hope the Legislature will address itself to the subject in good earnest, and that the committee will invite judges and Commonwealth's attorneys and other citizens who are in a position to know in what respect changes are desirable, especially in the direction of reduced expenses of government.

## THE OYSTER TAX.

The Portsmouth Times, in commenting on the Governor's message, says that, "like all up-country statesmen who want to make themselves solid with their neighbors, he wants to increase the tax on the poor oystermen." Would it not be equally as fair to say that in this comment our contemporary "wants to make itself solid with the oystermen"? The Governor suggests simply that the law be changed so as to prevent evasion and to compel those who are assessed to pay the tax as assessed to the Commonwealth.

The oysters belong to the State of Virginia, to the whole people of Virginia, and not to any one class, and it is entirely right and proper that those who catch oysters should give to the State its fair share of the catch.

There is a great deal of clap-trap in this cry against "taxing the poor oystermen." The oysterman does not pay the tax any more than the manufacturer pays the tax on tobacco. In all such cases the tax is added to the price of the article and is paid by the consumer. There is no reason under the sun why the State should not have a larger revenue from the large oyster traffic in its borders, and the Legislature now sitting should see to it that the laws are so framed as to make evasion impossible.

EMBARRASSED CONTEMPORARIES. Some of our free silver contemporaries that are honestly in favor of repealing the 10 per cent. tax on State banks find themselves somewhat embarrassed by the fact that the Hon. William Jennings Bryan is unequivocally opposed to State banks of issue. Mr. Bryan openly declared in the halls of Congress that he was not